

Origin: E&E Website
Date: 12/17/2004
First Name: Lillian
Last Name: Meyer
Address: P.O. Box 678
City: Biggs
State: CA
Topic: Public Safety: Hazards and Risk Analysis
Comments: Of all natural gas projects this sounds like the most logical one to me. I love the fact that it is located so far off shore. I have serious safety concerns when any projects are located within communities. The possibility of explosions, accidents and even terrorist attacks are serious concerns. With the project located so far out to sea I feel very strongly about continuing with it. Our state needs this. Please approve it.

G146-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website
First Name: Lillian
Last Name: Meyer
Address: P.O. Box 678
City: Biggs
State: CA
Additional Topic: Public Safety: Hazards and Risk Analysis
Comments: Of all natural gas projects this sounds like the most logical one to me. I love the fact that it is located so far off shore. I have serious safety concerns when any projects are located within communities. The possibility of explosions, accidents and even terrorist attacks are serious concerns. With the project located so far out to sea I feel very strongly about continuing with it. Our state needs this. Please approve it.

G297-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website
Date: 12/17/2004
First Name: Patti
Last Name: Meyer
Address: 146 Bluebird Ln.
City: Gridley
State: CA
Topic: Socioeconomics

Comments: It is a shame that those who can afford high energy prices are the ones that are usually listened to regarding a project like Cabrillo Port. Those who speak out against Cabrillo Port do not speak for the thousands of citizens that struggle to make ends meet and are burdened by high energy prices. This is a project that will not only lower energy bills but also pump millions of dollars into the local economy. It is your duty to allow Cabrillo Port to pass.

G143-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website

Date: 12/17/2004

First Name: Walt

Last Name: Meyer

Address: P.O. Box 366

City: Biggs

State: CA

Zip Code: 95917

Topic: Other/General Comment

Comments: The Energy Crisis of a few years ago shows what can happen when you allow special interests to prevent the progress our state desperately needs. We need a solution to our energy shortage problems and an LNG facility will be a good step towards that end. The BHP project makes the most sense because its offshore location alleviates many of the environmental, visual, and safety issues that would arise from an on-shore project. Additionally, the temporary nature of the structure allows it to exist only as long as it is needed. Should renewable resources become more viable, the project can be phased out over time. For these reasons, The Cabrillo Port LNG facility makes sense for California.

G108-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website
 Date: 12/09/2004
 First Name: Neal
 Last Name: Michaelis
 Address: 11887 Ellice St. #4
 City: Malibu
 State: CA
 Zip Code: 90265
 Phone No.: 310-589-0311
 Email: neal@dawntreaderfilms.com
 Address:
 Topic: Other/General Comment
 Comments: To whom it may concern,

G016

I am writing to request an extension to the comment period. The EIS/EIR has only recently been made available to the public and yet we have only until the 20th of this month to comment. This is a very lengthy and involved document which requires a substantial amount of time to read, digest and comment on. The public deserves more time to review this document. Many of those concerned have not even seen the EIS/EIR yet. In fact, this project has received very little attention in the press, and none that I know of on television. The public for the most part is completely unaware of what is being proposed. Even if they knew, they would need more time than is being given to comment on the proposal. For these reasons I am requesting an extension to the comment deadline. Please help the public in this way.

Sincerely,

Neal Michaelis
 (concerned coastal resident)

G016-1

All deepwater port applications fall under the authority of the Deepwater Port Act, which requires that a decision on the application be made within 330 days of the publication of the Notice of Application in the Federal Register. The Notice of Application for the Cabrillo Port Project was published in the Federal Register on January 27, 2004. Although the comment period (53 days) could not be extended at that time, a March 2006 Revised Draft EIR was recirculated under the CEQA for an additional public review period of 60 days. Section 1.4.1 contains additional information on this topic.

Section 1.5 contains information on opportunities for public comment. After the MARAD final license hearing, the public will have 45 days to comment on the Final EIS/EIR and the license application. The Federal and State agencies will have an additional 45 days to provide comments to the MARAD Administrator. The Administrator must issue the Record of Decision within 90 days after the final license hearing. The CSLC will hold a hearing to certify the EIR and make the decision whether to grant a lease. The California Coastal Commission will also hold a hearing. Comments received will be evaluated before any final decision is made regarding the proposed Project.

G016-1

Name (Please Print): Mildred Miele
 Organization/Agency: Private Citizen
 Street Address: 3107 So. Harbor Blvd.
 City: Oxnard State: CA Zip Code: 93039
 Email address: _____

Source:
Public Meeting - Oxnard PM

Date: 11/30/2004

Please provide written comments in the space below and drop this form into the comment box.

You may also submit comments

- Electronically through the Project Web site at <http://www.cabrilloport.ene.com>
- Electronically through the Docket Management System Web site (docket number 16877) at <http://dms.dot.gov>.
- Or by mail or email to following addresses:

Docket Management Facility
 Room PL-401
 400 Seventh Street SW
 Washington, DC 20590-0001

California State Lands Commission
 100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South
 Sacramento, CA 95825
 ogginsc@slc.ca.gov
 Attention: Cy Oggins

All comments must be received by 2 p.m. PST, December 20, 2004

Comments (Use other side or attach additional sheets if necessary): Oxnard and
surrounding area has been damaged enough
with oil field chemicals, etc and waste
from Naval Bases. ^{Among many things} It is time our **G091-1**
area is allowed to rejuvenate.
Also, why should companies from
another Country come in to
destroy our beautiful area and
put our lives in danger. Let

No action will be taken until the environmental review process is completed.

G091-1

The CLSC, the USCG, and MARAD received an application for a deepwater port off the shore of Ventura County and have therefore analyzed that location.

The Deepwater Port Act has numerous requirements for an applicant to own and operate a deepwater port. The licensee of a deepwater port must be a U.S. citizen. Citizen of the United States means:

- Any person who is a United States citizen by law, birth, or naturalization;
- Any State, State agency, or group of states; or
- Any corporation, partnership, or other association: a) That is organized under the laws of any state; b) Whose president, chairman of the board of directors, and general partners or their equivalents, are persons described in paragraph (1) of the definition; and c) That has no more of its directors who are not persons described in paragraph (1) of the definition than constitute a minority of the number required for a quorum to conduct the business of the board of directors.

Among other requirements, BHPB Billiton LNG International Inc. qualifies to be a potential licensee of a deepwater port because it is incorporated in the U.S.

them destroy their own
country.

Sholly, Brian

Date: 12/20/04

From: Flynn, Louise [LFlynn@comdt.uscg.mil]
Sent: Monday, December 20, 2004 12:54 PM
To: Sholly, Brian
Subject: FW: EIR/EIS CABRILLO PORT COMMENTS

-----Original Message-----

From: Kusano, Ken LT
Sent: Monday, December 20, 2004 1:39 PM
To: Flynn, Louise; 'dwp@comdt.uscg.mil'
Subject: FW: EIR/EIS CABRILLO PORT COMMENTS

>V/r, KK
>LT Ken Kusano
>U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters
>Deepwater Port Standards Division (G-MSO-5)
>202-267-1184

-----Original Message-----

From: WDMiley@aol.com [mailto:WDMiley@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, December 20, 2004 2:28 AM
To: ogginsc@slc.ca.gov; Kusano, Ken LT
Subject: EIR/EIS CABRILLO PORT COMMENTS

12/19/04

TO: CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION (ATTN: CY OGGINS)
100 HOWE AVENUE, SUITE 100-SOUTH, CA, SACRAMENTO, CA 95825-8202
(ogginsc@slc.ca.gov)

U.S. COAST GUARD, 2100 SECOND STREET, S.W., WASHINGTON, D.C.
20593-001 (ATTN: LT KEN KUSANO (G-MSO-5)
(kkusano@comdt.uscg.mil)

FROM: BILL MILEY, MPH, 919 NO. SIGNAL STREET, OJAI, CA 93023 (805-646-2615)

SUBJECT: EIS/EIR IMPACT REPORT: CABRILLO PORT DEEPWATER PORT PROPOSAL AND APPLICATION

Please find below my comments and critiques of the EIS/EIR report for the CABRILLO PORT DEEPWATER PORT LNG FLOATING STORAGE AND REGASIFICATION UNIT AND DISTRIBUTION PLAN FOR OFFLOADING THE NATURAL GAS TO THE MAINLAND (by BHP).

A snapshot of my comments below is:

this proposal is probably in response to the California State Energy Commission's interest and conclusion that bringing in LNG to add to the mix of energy sources for California would help California's future without notable risk...the world has changed since 9/11 with rapid communication for the good guys and the bad guys...and here I am concerned about the bad guys. The bad guys (terrorists) can and hopefully not but probably will raise the risk to an LNG terminal to an unacceptable level...the unknown is always there. The proposal will be placing at risk a population of over 300,000 folks in the immediate coastal area and an additional 500,000 folks in Ventura County. An "explosion" at the Port, in a ship or via a ship which has been hijacked to the Port of Hueneme will create long term disaster to this coastal community and the

G442-1

G442-1

Table 4.2-2 and Sections 4.2.6.1 and 4.2.7.6 contain information on the threat of terrorist attacks.

entire southern California area. Alternative energy sources (not based on fossil fuels) need to be emphasized now and into the long term future with fossil fuels reserved for the important and use that cannot be served from alternative energy resources. In Camarillo sits the Shell Solar facility making photovoltaic panels on a commercial basis. This alternative source needs government support for household and business energy supplies allowing our natural gas from land sources to be used for base electricity production (Ormond and Mandalay Generating Plants) and heating uses.

My comments on the EIR/EIR

Executive Summary

ES-2 * The California Energy Commission's recommendation to diversity and secure more natural gas through LNG from foreign source places California at risk of a long supply line and dependence upon foreign governments stability and potential price and currency risks...more of our dollars will be going to foreign countries, businesses and "international corporations". Now it the time for focus upon California's energy abundance which is solar. Our government- California state and U.S. Government should be maximizing the solar photovoltaic technology which is currently established here. Sun, Sun, Sun and more Sun that is what California has uniquely that other U.S. states do not have.

Public Safety

ES-13 * lines 23-27 Since fire and explosion are two key risk issues of this proposal, a major responsibility will fall on local officials- government administration, fire, police, environmental specialists for responding to risk events and to prevent such. Since the Independent Risk Assessment Report is restricted for security reasons, it will be important that the public know what summary comments and conclusions each of these official bodies take and publicly states for this risk, management and public costs involvement in both standby modes and in dealing with a disaster.

ES-17 * chart Design Criteria and Standards: CSLC is "currently developing design criteria and evaluating industry standards that will apply to LNG terminals in California. It's unclear at this time whether the proposed Project will be subject to these requirements." This does not sound good as it sounds like if the CSLC doesn't have jurisdiction it won't apply...what should exist is that the regulatory science should apply since it is designed to protect the California population...lets not let this slip away because of jurisdiction. How can an application be approved when the "industry standards" are not finished...remember "building codes and upgrades" for earthquakes.

ES-18 * lines 24-28 Operation Manuals and Security Plan...this calls for approval by the USCG and regular review. This should be also approved and reviewed by State and local Government including Fire, Law Enforcement, and Environmental Specialists. The people of California are at risk and our governments will be handing any disasters.

ES-19 * lines 31-38 pipe line accidents...since this is based on past accident ratios, the future must calculate intentional damage from terrorist events.

ES - 20 * lines 25-29 marine traffic and Point Mugu: Since Point Mugu is a major military base with advanced "military" missions here we are bringing into the immediate area more "targets" for fire and explosions and "fuel" for potential terrorists activities. Also there seems to be an increased risk for humans caused during the operation by "failures" which could create "problems" with the Point Mugu operations. Not good for our military establishment and our military readiness and research and development.

ES - 22 * lines 9-12 emissions. This proposal will be emitting excessive pollution emissions and "require a USEPA permit and offsets". Offsetting

G442-2

G442-3

G442-4

G442-5

G442-6

G442-7

G442-8

G442-9

G442-2

Sections 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, and 4.10.1.3 contain information on the need for natural gas, the role and status of energy conservation and renewable energy sources, and the California Energy Action Plan.

Sections 1.2.2 and 1.2.3 contain updated information on natural gas needs in the U.S. and California. Forecast information has been obtained from the U.S. Department of Energy's Energy Information Agency and from the California Energy Commission.

Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 address conservation and renewable energy sources, within the context of the California Energy Commission's 2005 Integrated Energy Report and other State and Federal energy reports, as alternatives to replace additional supplies of natural gas.

G442-3

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

G442-4

Sections 4.2.4, 4.2.7.3, and 4.2.8.2 identify agencies with the authority and responsibility for safety standards, design reviews, and compliance inspections. Section 2.1 and Appendix C3-2 identify applicable safety standards.

G442-5

Section 2.1 contains information on design criteria and specifications, final design requirements, and regulations governing the construction of the FSRU. The Cabrillo Port must be designed in accordance with applicable standards, and the U.S. Coast Guard has final approval. Section 4.2.4 contains information on Federal and State agency jurisdiction and cooperation. The Deepwater Port Act specifies regulations that all deepwater ports must meet; Section 4.2.7.3 contains information on design and safety standards for the deepwater port. Section 4.2.8.2 contains information on pipeline safety and inspections. Impact EJ-1 in Section 4.19.4 addresses additional pipeline design requirements in areas of low-income and minority communities. The EIS/EIR's analyses have been developed with consideration of these factors and regulations and in full conformance with the requirements of NEPA and the CEQA.

G442-6

Table 4.2-3 identifies agency authority over all Project elements. At

the FSRU, Federal agencies would have jurisdiction. Section 4.2.7.6 and the Independent Risk Assessment (Appendix C1) contain information on public safety impacts from various incidents at the FSRU. The analysis indicates that the maximum impact distance of an accident would involve a vapor cloud dispersion extending 6.3 nautical miles (7.3 miles) from the FSRU. The FSRU would be located approximately 12.01 nautical miles (13.83 miles) offshore; therefore, consequences of an accident involving LNG transport by carrier and storage on the FSRU would extend no closer than 5.7 nautical miles (6.5 miles) from the shoreline. Figure ES-1 depicts the consequence distances surrounding the FSRU location for worst credible events.

G442-7

"Potential Pipeline Incidents" in Section 4.2.8.4 addresses this topic.

G442-8

Section 4.3.1.1 discusses existing offshore naval operations. The deepwater port would be outside the Point Mugu Sea Range but would be within the Navy's SOCAL Range Complex. The Applicant-proposed routing for LNG carrier approaches (shown in Figure 4.3-2) was developed in consultation with the USCG and the U.S. Navy. The routes would transit in the vicinity of the SOCAL Range Complex or through a small section of the Point Mugu Sea Range. LNG carriers would not enter the 3-NM restricted area around San Nicholas Island or the 4-NM naval danger zones and restricted areas near San Clemente Island. Impact MT-6 in Section 4.3.4 contains additional information on this topic.

G442-9

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

The Project has been modified since issuance of the October 2004 Draft EIS/EIR. See Section 1.4.2 for a summary of Project changes. Section 4.6.1.3 contains revised information on Project emissions and proposed control measures. Section 4.6.4 discusses the health effects attributed to air pollutants and includes revised impacts and mitigation measures.

excessive pollution emissions by buying credits from somewhere else is a disaster for the 300,000 folks who live within the air shed and will be breathing the emissions. This logic is strictly money based and not public health based to reduce the medium and long term impact on the lives of people. This is not acceptable.

ES - 27 * lines 27-34 Channel Islands Sanctuary...the Channel Islands and the surrounding waters are a protected area designated as a "Marine Sanctuary" including the Islands themselves. Again, as we found with the oil platforms off this coast, no new ones are being allowed due to potential damage to the ecosystems. Locating an LNG terminal in or near this "Marine Sanctuary" and the Islands themselves is potentially risky to this unreplicable natural environment. It does not belong in or near such a national treasure.

ES - 17-27 environmental justice for lower income residents...potentially impacting two mobile home parks by adding a 24/7 risk to their lives by passing large amounts of "warmed" LNG is very dangerous and seems to place less value on their lives. Without substantive mitigation beyond the "giving public notices and information" this is unacceptable. What needs to be done to adequately mitigate this risk is to create in an equal environment two mobile homes parks away from this pipeline and move everyone to a completely safe location.

page 1-6 --1.0 Introduction.1.2.2.1 National Natural Gas Needs...When the Federal Government passed the Deepwater Port Act DWPA it apparently did not anticipate floating barges off major population coastlines creating their own "port". Ventura County is being asked to take a large risk of being the adjacent neighbor to a floating port for millions of cubic feet of cooled and then warmed natural gas which will be used by consumers well beyond this county. Fossil fuels are limited in supply. Increased use of renewable and non fossil sources is what this national needs. California has a natural source which few other states have...solar energy for electricity and also for water heating and space heating. By sourcing future energy needs to foreign natural gas transported in the form of LNG removes the effort to research and development photovoltaic and solar insolation for heating and energy production.

page 1-7--lines 17 24 and 33-40- cost and availability of natural gas fuel...in the 1980's a million cu/feet of natural gas was very cheap...so cheap that few were looking for new sources. And now the price has skyrocketed. With increased demand for energy which has more "energy quality" and less green house gases, interest in natural gas goes up. But the long term future is not with bringing in foreign fuel more and more but in learning to develop and use what renewal and non-pollution resources we have here. Think 50 and 150 years ahead now...solar energy is the future...lets not postpone the inevitable by becoming dependent on foreign suppliers in countries which are politically historically unstable (except for Australia). Once we become dependent on foreign suppliers just watch the fuel costs continue to climb and we will be without alternatives and will have an even greater national "Current-Accounts" deficit and trade deficit. Shell Solar in Camarillo should be a primary focus of our support.

page 1-8 lines 8-15 and 37-41...California Energy Commission speaks about short-term and mid-term demand and the need to reduce potential supply interruptions. It states that a better transport system through the Rocky Mountains would aid in getting Canadian Natural Gas...now that is a worthy goal to continue to keep our dollars for energy within the North American Continent and safer from terrorists plans. How can we believe that we are securing our energy future by creating a floating LNG port off of Ventura County and buying LNG from a multinational corporation which gets its fuel from such unstable sources as Indonesia, Russia and South American. The risk of future natural gas interruptions is in my opinion high. Just read the international news and the risk for future terrorists plans and attacks. Lets not make ourselves

G442-9
cont'd

G442-10

G442-11

G442-12

2004/G442

G442-10

The FSRU would be located outside of the current boundary of the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS) and vessels associated with Cabrillo Port operations would not be expected to enter the CINMS. Sections 4.7.1.4, 4.13.2.2, and 4.20.1.5 discuss the potential expansion of the CINMS boundary, which is not proposed at this time. Sections 4.7.4, 4.15.4, 4.16.4, and 4.18.4 describe potential impacts on the marine environment and proposed mitigation measures to reduce those potential impacts.

G442-11

Sections 4.19.1 and 4.19.4 contain information on potential Project impacts on minority and low-income communities and mitigation measures to address such impacts.

G442-12

Section 1.2 discusses the natural gas needs of California and the U.S. and dependence on foreign sources of natural gas.

Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 address conservation and renewable energy sources, within the context of the California Energy Commission's 2005 Integrated Energy Report and other State and Federal energy reports, as alternatives to replace additional supplies of natural gas.

more vulnerable to economic and energy disasters. The Federal government just within the past week stressed the value and need to increase supply logistics for natural gas from Canada.

page 4.1.16 (introduction to envir. analysis) 3rd paragraph...with coastal fog a common occurrence off the central California coast due to subsidence inversions and high and low pressure systems which stall weather movements, we are at increased risk of accidentally released LNG or its warmed version into the air and the low elevation air masses in this area. It seems that were this area not populated with over 300,000 folks and mostly "vacant" that the potential risk would be greatly reduced. Why place hundreds of thousands of people at risk to their health and their lives for the benefit of a short and mid term energy supply (California Energy Commission statement on needs for short and mid-term natural gas).

page 4.2-5 public safety...Table 4.2-1, line 3 "risk of hijacking..."... "paper approval" for arriving LNG carriers seems less than needed based on past terrorists activities and sophistication. It would seem that a Coast Guard ship should be accompanying each carrier on its arrival to prevent it being commandeered and run into the Port of Hueneme or other vulnerable sites. Each Coast Guard event should be paid for by the multinational corporation. No tax payer funded support services or protective services should be provided; any used should be reimbursed by BHP. But full protection of United States citizens and property should be accomplished. This cost will need to be built into the cost of the fuel and thus may make it less competitive to other energies.

page 4.2-6 Table 4.2-1 line 12 "vapor dispersion"....since the modeling was based on "smaller releases or events" and that there is "lack of real-world accident data for such large releases and uncertainties regarding the actual size of a release..." placing a floating platform for LNG porting off a coastline adjacent to a county with 800,000 + folks (going to over 1 million in near future years) seems very risky and imprudent to say the least. This sounds like an untested idea relative to being adjacent to a large people population. Prudence seems the watchword here and placing it on a coastal area where there are no people would be reasonable and desirable and would please the risk-management folks. Question: Just who will be paying the bills for accident and liability insurance to cover the damage and to provide the insurance for future risks.

page 4.2-7 Table 4.2-1 line 13 "city and county emergency services..."...Standby emergency services (personnel and equipment) should be available 24/7 for the increased risk from a floating port for LNG and the increased size and volume of natural gas being transported underground in Ventura County. On page 4.2-89 a short paragraph speaks to increased taxes to help with emergency services. But unless that money is available upfront and programmed to provide 24/7 personnel and equipment properly trained for such a risk disaster, this is not enough. Upfront funding for county, city and state and federal emergency services should be provided and these costs built into the cost of the natural gas to the consumer.

page 4.2-11 Public Safety 4.2.2.1 (Risk Assessment for LNG Deepwater Port)...With the process of assessment described on pp 4.2-11 and 12, on page 4.2-15 lines 16-33 under "Frequency of Terrorist Acts" a "worst-case credible scenarios" is mentioned. It goes on starting at line 23 the say that the "...frequency of probability of arson, intentional sabotage, or a terrorist attack has not been estimated for the LNG DWP Independent Risk Assessment, because this cannot be reliably estimated." Now, since the previous basically said we cannot predict terrorist futures for an LNG port, at least now until we have more terrorist events and terrorist intervention and

G442-12.1

G442-12.1

Section 3.3.7 contains information on location of the Project. The deepwater port would be 12.01 nautical miles (13.83 miles) offshore, as shown on Figure ES-1. As discussed in Section 4.2.7.6 and the Independent Risk Assessment (Appendix C1), consequences of an accident at the deepwater port would not reach the shoreline.

G442-13

G442-13

Section 4.3.1.3 discusses the two tugboats that would be permanently assigned to the FSRU and that would monitor for the presence of other vessels and notify any approaching vessels to avoid the safety zone. Section 4.2.7.3 and Appendix C3-2 present regulations related to the FSRU and LNG carriers.

G442-14

G442-14

The Independent Risk Assessment (IRA) has been updated since issuance of the October 2004 Draft EIS/EIR. The lead agencies directed the preparation of the current IRA, and the U.S. Department of Energy's Sandia National Laboratories independently reviewed it. See Section 4.2, Appendix C1, and Appendix C2 for additional information on third-party verification of the IRA.

G442-15

Section 4.2.7.6 and the Independent Risk Assessment (Appendix C1) contain information on public safety impacts from various incidents at the FSRU. The analysis indicates that the maximum impact distance of an accident would involve a vapor cloud dispersion extending 6.3 nautical miles (7.3 miles) from the FSRU. The FSRU would be located approximately 12.01 nautical miles (13.83 miles) offshore; therefore, consequences of an accident involving LNG transport by carrier and storage on the FSRU would extend no closer than 5.7 nautical miles (6.5 miles) from the shoreline. Figure ES-1 depicts the consequence distances surrounding the FSRU location for worst credible events.

G442-16

G442-15

Section 4.2.5 contains information on the Applicant's insurance coverage and cost recovery for incidents.

G442-16

Section 4.2.5 contains information on liability in case of an accident and reimbursement for local agencies.

strategies, placing such a port next to 300,000 folks and near and additional 500,000 would not seem very prudent. The risk seems to outweigh the rewards.

page 4.2-27 Public Safety 4.2.3.2 (Risk Evaluation -LNG Carriers)...The evaluation says that the "worst-case impacts ...were not specifically modeled, although impacts from a credible release from a carrier transporting LNG in smaller Moss spheres would not be expected to be greater than for the FSRU Worst-Case Releases #1 and #2." Nothing in this statement speaks about the movement of the carrier in the Channel islands waterways on its way to the Port. Movement of the ship and where it might be if an explosion occurs or if the ship is damaged inside a storm and its potential impact if drifting towards the shoreline and the Port of Hueneme. Fire and explosion during the carrier's movement was not assessed and needs to be. This is where the terrorist acts likely would occur.

page 4.2-32 Public Safety Table 4.2.4-2 "corrosion"...26% of the events of Pipeline Incidents were caused by internal and external corrosion. This certainly speaks to the problem of placing lots of increased volume of natural gas into pipe which may be corroding now and will create pipeline incidents in the future...maybe only new pipes should be used to increase the safety factor and reduce the risk to folks in Ventura County.

page 4.2-38 Public Safety Table 4.2.4-6 Annual Trans. Accidental Deaths... from reading this table my humor says that we should be sending vehicles through the natural gas pipelines as they are the safest.

page 4.2-47 Public Safety lines 18-25 (FSRU self inspection...)...the requirement mentioned here to self inspect every 12 months with a report to the Coast Guard and verified inspection if needed by the C.G does not seem good enough for a facility off the shore of almost a million folks. This should be a coast Guard inspection annually with the results posted on a public website with penalties for violations.

page 4.2-68 Table 4.2.8-1 (Summary of Public Safety Impacts and Mitigation Measures)Line PS-2 "A high-energy collision..." AMM MT-6a Patrol Safety Zone...is this mitigation really effect to have a tug/supply vessel be the standby duty patrol to keep out intruders...not very likely effective...it would seem that such a patrol should be armed with the option of "firing" to stop intruders. MMPS-2c again does not seem realistic to have a "standby tug" to intercept approaching vessels...needs to be an armed, military type vessel under the control of the Coast Guard and paid for by BHP and built into the price of the gas.

page 4.2-88 lines 23-34 (Local emergency services)...Because of the increase in transmission lines and volumes of natural gas being (in future) transported if a LNG port is established the 24/7 availability of emergency services should be enlarged to respond to such events. Also the response to an offshore FSRU event or carrier event which might come close to or hit the shore needs to be programmed for 24/7 response. Such costs need to be built into the cost of the natural gas to future customers and upfront moneys provided to local emergency responders before such operations are started. The customers of such gas will be charged for these costs.

page 4.13-1 lines 21 and 22 (Offshore and Coastal Zone)...Since the California State Lands Commission will determine whether a lease is granted to BHP, the State Lands Commission will be giving public lands use to a private company for their profit. Here the Commission should consider the appropriateness of "giving away public property" to a private corporation which generates profits for their stockholders. It would seem only right that a Lease for sub-sea pipelines use be charged for based volume of transmission. Thus recovering for the State of California moneys for use of public lands for a private profit.

G442-17

G442-17

Sections 4.2.2, 4.2.6.1 and 4.2.7.6 contain revised text on terrorism risks. Section 4.2.6 discusses the results of the Independent Risk Assessment (Appendix C1). Section 4.3.1.4 contains a discussion of "Disabled Vessels and Anchorage."

G442-18

G442-18

The regulation cited in the comment is only one of many regulations concerning deepwater port safety. Sections 4.2.4, 4.2.7.3 and 4.2.8.2 identify agencies with the authority and responsibility for safety standards, design reviews, and compliance inspections. Section 2.1 and Appendix C3-2 identify applicable safety standards.

G442-19

G442-19

The measure cited in the comment (now AM MT-3a) is only one of many measures that would mitigate the impact of release of LNG at the deepwater port. The discussion of impacts in Section 4.2.7.6 has been revised.

G442-20

G442-20

Sections 4.2.5.4 and 4.16.1.2 under "Emergency Planning and Response Capabilities" address this topic.

G442-21

G442-21

The proposed Project includes the construction of new pipelines that would tie into an existing pipeline system. The entire pipeline system is subject to Federal and State requirements for routine inspection, maintenance, and repair, as described in Sections 4.2.8.1 and 4.2.8.2, which are intended to ensure that pipeline integrity is maintained.

G442-22

Section 4.13.1 contains information on sensitive land uses in proximity to proposed and alternative pipeline routes, such as schools. There are no schools in the immediate vicinity of either of the proposed pipeline routes. Section 4.2.8 describes regulations regarding pipelines, including the requirement to establish public education programs to prevent and respond to pipeline emergencies. Section 4.2.8.4 contains information on the estimated risk of Project pipeline incidents. Section 4.16.1.2 describes emergency planning and response capabilities in the Project area.

The proposed pipelines within Oxnard city limits would meet standards that are more stringent than those of existing pipelines because they would meet the minimum design criteria for a U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) Class 3 location. Also, MM PS-4c includes the installation of additional mainline valves equipped with either remote valve controls or automatic line break

controls. SoCalGas operates high-pressure natural gas pipelines throughout Southern California.

G442-22

If approved, the California State Lands Commission would grant a lease of State land for the subsea pipelines, with an annual rental determined by the Commission's regulations. Section 1.1.4 discusses this topic.

page 4.13-3 lines 3 -10 (Offshore and Coastal Zone)...with the ultimate size of the Ormond Beach wetland to be at least 750 acres, and with a restoration study currently underway by the Coastal Commission, it is conceivable that the Center Road may be within the extended/buffer wetland area when historical wetlands geography is known. This will have implications for negative impacts on the ground areas, potential wetlands, and for the issue of maintenance and inspection of a laid pipeline.

G442-23

page 4.13-12 lines 16-22 (California Coastal Conservancy)... This documents the specific plans the Conservancy is working on to acquire additional wetland acreage with implications for animal protection from "man" intrusion and for Recreational value of the wetland for "nature recreation and environmental education".

page 4.15-5 lines 2-5 (Recreation)...the listed recreational beaches are somewhat north (as noted) of the proposed landing for the natural gas pipelines, but the proximity of coastal recreational facilities which are used by thousands of folks during a year raises the potential risk for a LNG disaster if a terrorist hijacked ship would be "run" into the coastal zone during a high use time to disrupt normal social functions and show the vulnerability of our government. Placing a LNG floating platform in a highly populated area is risky at best.

G442-24

page 4.15-5 lines 11-26 (Ormond Beach)...for many years the city of Oxnard has slowly planned to protect and develop into a nature preserve/recreation area the Oxnard Beach wetland area. The Savior Road Design Team (community organization) has worked for many years in addition to the Oxnard Beach Task Force (a citizen's group headed by co-chairs from the Coastal Commission and Saviers Road Design Team) to establish these 700 to 1000 acres as a natural and historical wetland and to restore them along with facilities for public access and educational value for future generations of people interested in nature. New and improved access to the wetlands and the coastal beaches are planned and may be impacted by the LNG processing plant and the pipelines.

G442-25

page 4.16-5 pages 10-16 (Health and Safety Services)...with 25 uniformed firefighters on duty at any one time which was noted as being less than the national ratio of 1 per 1,000 people within a city, and with 1.15 police officers per 1000 residents, resources for dealing with a LNG disaster seem potentially strained and lacking in strength. The LNG applicant should be required to fund, up front, the additional of sufficient firefighters and law enforcement and other emergency personnel to have available 24/7 adequate resources to manage an emergency. These costs should be built into the cost of the natural gas coming from LNG.

G442-26

page 4.16-7 lines 19-30 (Environmental harm)...state law conflicts regarding the State Lands Commission view on spills of natural gas (yes) and the Fish and Game Department view on natural gas spills (no). This 180 degree needs to be resolved in favor of both departments having a full jurisdiction over a natural gas spill before this operation is approved.

G442-27

page 4.20-4 lines 24-39 (Point Mugu Sea Range Operations)...listed are the currently planned and past operations...with nothing said about the potential for future testing of ordinance, aircraft and missiles which have not been foreseen as of now...the potential restriction and vulnerability created from a LNG operation to this unique military installation and testing range is very serious and should be seen as potentially compromising the value of this military mission. Placing an LNG floating "port" near this type of military base and testing range could seriously compromise our country's security and increase its potential for terrorist targeting it.

G442-28

page 4.20-13 lines 33-36 (Offshore and Onshore Natural Gas Pipelines)...this statement points to the risk of two LNG terminals off this coast and the potential for a pipeline incident causing "serious injury or fatality to members of the public" which could occur. Again this raises the question of why place such a potential risk in a highly populated area.

G442-23

As described in Section 2.3.2, the shore crossing would be installed beneath Ormond Beach. Sections 4.8.1 and 4.14.1.2 discuss Ormond Beach wetlands. Section 4.8.4 discusses mitigation measures to minimize impacts on wetlands. The presence of the pipelines under Ormond Beach would not restrict access to the area for recreation or otherwise alter recreation opportunities at Ormond Beach. During construction, the horizontal directional boring activities would be contained within the Reliant Energy property, and the pipeline would be buried underneath the beach. This topic is discussed further in Sections 4.15.4 and 4.2.8.4. Updated information about the restoration efforts at Ormond Beach is included in Section 4.13.2. Figure 4.13-1 has been revised.

G442-24

Section 4.2.7.6 and the Independent Risk Assessment (Appendix C1) contain information on public safety impacts from various incidents at the FSRU. The analysis indicates that the maximum impact distance of an accident would involve a vapor cloud dispersion extending 6.3 nautical miles (7.3 miles) from the FSRU. The FSRU would be located approximately 12.01 nautical miles (13.83 miles) offshore; therefore, consequences of an accident involving LNG transport by carrier and storage on the FSRU would extend no closer than 5.7 nautical miles (6.5 miles) from the shoreline. Figure ES-1 depicts the consequence distances surrounding the FSRU location for worst credible events.

G442-25

See the response to Comment G442-23.

G442-26

"Emergency Planning and Response Capabilities" in Section 4.16.1.2 contains a revised discussion on this topic. As discussed in Section 4.2, the consequences of an accident at the deepwater port would not reach shore.

G442-27

Section 4.2.5.2 contains a revised discussion of The California Harbor and Navigation Code, which imposes liability for natural gas discharges.

G442-28

Sections 4.3.1 and 4.20.1 contain updated discussions of operations at the Point Mugu Sea Range. It would be speculative to evaluate the potential impact of the presence of Cabrillo Port on unknown or unanticipated operations at the Sea Range.

Thank you.

2004/G442

Origin: E&E Website
Date: 12/19/2004
First Name: Jennifer
Last Name: Miller
Title: Marketing & Student Recruitment, Pepperdine University
Address: 24255 Pacific Coast Highway
City: Malibu
State: CA
Zip Code: 90263
Phone No.: 818-389-7701
Email Address: jennifer.miller@pepperdine.edu

Topic: Biological Resources - Marine, Other/General Comment

Comments: I was worried when I first heard about this project, because I hate to see anything else that could have a negative impact on the delicate balance of marine biology off California's coast. After reviewing this plan, it seems to me that its placement miles from the protected coastal marine sanctuaries puts it well beyond the range where it would do much harm.

G251-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website
Date: 11/09/2004
First Name: Andy
Last Name: Mills
Title: External Affairs Director
Address: 3488 Tree Frog Lane
City: Placerville
State: CA
Zip Code: 95667
Phone No.: 530-626-6898
Email Address: saveourranches@aol.com
Topic: Alternatives

Comments: I support the conclusion in the Draft EIS/R that the Pt. Conception onshore site alternative is not feasible. The negative impacts to public safety and the unique natural resources in the area would be unacceptable.

G002-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website
Date: 12/20/2004
First Name: Greg
Last Name: Mitchelle
Address: 7121 Dublin Blvd.
City: Dublin
State: CA
Zip Code: 94568
Topic: Other/General Comment

Comments: BHP is a good company with a solid history of working with the environment and supporting local communities where there projects are housed. This is not another example of a company trying to make money. Sure they are going to make money on the project, but they are also spending millions just to get the project approved. We are the ones using the natural gas and giving companies like these the demand. I like natural gas and I will continue to support its production before I would ever think of supporting a coal mine.

G341-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website
Date: 12/19/2004
First Name: Vernell
Last Name: Moddison
Topic: Hazardous Materials
Comments: I used to live near a nuclear power plant. I understand hazardous materials and LNG seems trivial to other energy resources. Yes, there is risk associated with natural gas and its transportation, but there have been pipelines and usage of natural gas in the state for something like 40 years. I'm sure that have been problems, but in my years living here I've haven't heard of any. I'm not sure why people have a sudden fear of natural gas. I believe BHP will take every precaution to prevent an accident. As well, they will be regulated by the state to ensure everyone's safety. Thank you for allowing me to comment.

G194-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Please DO NOT allow the Cabrillo Port LNG facility to go forward for the following reasons:

- 1). The proposed project represents an unprecedented hazard to Southern California coastal communities. Not only would it become a terrorist target, but if it explodes it could cause a catastrophic result.
 - 2). The required exclusion zone would put a burden on the Coast guard and American Taxpayer all so an Australian Company can make a profit. The zone would impede shipping and recreational boat use and create confusion in the world's busiest shipping lane.
 - 3). The proposed Operation will make property values fall due to the unsightly appearance of the operation as a constant reminder to it's danger to us.
 - 4). Tourism and whale watching will drop for the same reason.
 - 5). The world famous California coastline will lose beauty, integrity and safety as a result of this project.
 - 6). The channel islands national park will be put at danger along with it's marine sanctuaries.
 - 7). This project puts America more dependent on foreign sources of enegy further weakening our country.
 - 8).The current project would contribute no more than approximately one-quarter of one percent to our nation's energy needs.
- PROTECT CALIFORNIA CITIZENS,DO NOT ALLOW THIS PROJECT TO MOVE FORWARD!
- Sincerely, Tom Molloy

G507-1

Section 4.2.6.1 discusses the risk of terrorist acts, and Section 4.2.7 discusses public safety risks involving the FSRU and LNG carriers.

G507-1

G507-2

G507-2

Sections 2.2.4, 4.3.1.4, and 4.3.4 address the size of the safety zone, how it would be established, and the potential impacts on marine traffic. The FSRU would be able to rotate 360° around the mooring turret. The safety zone would extend 500 m from the circle formed by the FSRU's stern, the outer edge of the facility, rotating around the mooring turret. See Figure 4.3-4 for an illustration of the potential safety zone and area to be avoided. The safety zone could not be made any larger because its size is governed by international law.

G507-3

G507-4

G507-5

G507-6

G507-7

G507-3

Section 4.15.4 discusses impacts on recreational boating. Section 2.3.1 describes the the safety zone and Area to be Avoided around the FSRU.

G507-4

Section 4.16.1.2 contains updated information on property values.

G507-5

Section 4.4 discusses aesthetic impacts and Section 4.2 discusses public safety impacts of the Project.

G507-6

The FSRU would be located outside of the current boundary of the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS) and vessels associated with Cabrillo Port operations would not be expected to enter the CINMS. Sections 4.7.1.4, 4.13.2.2, and 4.20.1.5 discuss the potential expansion of the CINMS boundary, which is not proposed at this time. Sections 4.7.4, 4.15.4, 4.16.4, and 4.18.4 describe potential impacts on the marine environment and proposed mitigation measures to reduce those potential impacts.

G507-7

Section 1.2 discusses dependence on foreign energy sources.

Name (Please Print): Lynne Moore Source: Public Meeting - Oxnard PM
 Organization/Agency: NO LNG Date: 11/30/2004
 Street Address: 4928 Thille St
 City: Vta State: CA Zip Code: 93003
 Email address: _____

Please provide written comments in the space below and drop this form into the comment box.

You may also submit comments

- Electronically through the Project Web site at <http://www.cabrilloport.ene.com>
- Electronically through the Docket Management System Web site (docket number 16877) at <http://dms.dot.gov>
- Or by mail or email to following addresses:

Docket Management Facility
 Room PL-401
 400 Seventh Street SW
 Washington, DC 20590-0001

California State Lands Commission
 100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South
 Sacramento, CA 95825
 ogginsc@slc.ca.gov
 Attention: Cy Oggins

All comments must be received by 2 p.m. PST, December 20, 2004

Comments (Use other side or attach additional sheets if necessary): I'm concerned
about the terminal as well as the
pipeline on land, the unprecedented
use of a 36" pipeline through a
residential area. We need to **G088-1**
focus our efforts & funds on
sustainable forms of energy, **G088-2**
not fossil fuels ~~we~~ that present
tremendous risks to the population.

No action will be taken until the environmental review process is completed.

G088-1

Section 4.2 discusses offshore and onshore public safety risks. The use of 36-inch pipeline is specifically discussed under Impact PS-4 in Section 4.2.8.4.

G088-2

Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 address conservation and renewable energy sources, within the context of the California Energy Commission's 2005 Integrated Energy Report and other State and Federal energy reports, as alternatives to replace additional supplies of natural gas.

G088-3

See the response to Comment G088-1.

No experiments should be
done in residential areas
that potentially risk lives
and livelihoods.

G088-3

Origin: E&E Website
Date: 12/17/2004
First Name: Charles
Last Name: Moran
Address: 23852 Pacific Coast Highway
#595
City: Malibu
State: CA
Zip Code: 90265
Phone No.: 310-506-8466
Email Address: charles.moran@pepperdine.edu
Topic: Socioeconomics

Comments: I believe the proposed LNG facility will do great benefit for residents in Southern California. While there is obviously risk involved with this project, the expected gain has so much more potential. LNG is a temporary, but needed, solution to our energy crisis, and the proposal should be affirmed.

G128-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Comment Form—Cabrillo Port LNG Deepwater Port draft EIS/EIR

Name (Please Print): FRED MORTENSEN

Organization/Agency: HOME OWNER

Street Address: 1701 ZIRCON AVE

City: OXNARD State: CA Zip Code: 93030

Email address: _____

Source:
Public Meeting - Oxnard AM
Date: 11/30/2004

Please provide written comments in the space below and drop this form into the comment box.

You may also submit comments

- Electronically through the Project Web site at <http://www.cabrilloport.ene.com>
- Electronically through the Docket Management System Web site (docket number 16877) at <http://dms.dot.gov>.
- Or by mail or email to following addresses:

Docket Management Facility
Room PL-401
400 Seventh Street SW
Washington, DC 20590-0001

California State Lands Commission
100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South
Sacramento, CA 95825
ogginsc@slc.ca.gov
Attention: Cy Oggins

All comments must be received by 2 p.m. PST, December 20, 2004

Comments (Use other side or attach additional sheets if necessary): my concern is
that the alternate route "B" is not good for residents as
the route would pass by 3 schools and a hospital and
many medical buildings. The installation of the pipeline
will also disrupt traffic of a main East-West street
and maintenance of this line would again disrupt
traffic.

G113-1

No action will be taken until the environmental review process is completed.

G113-1

The Project has been modified since issuance of the October 2004 Draft EIS/EIR. Section 2.4.1 describes the proposed Center Road Pipeline and facilities. Section 2.4.3 contains information on maintenance of onshore pipelines and facilities. Section 3.3.12 contains revised information on alternative onshore pipeline routes.

Comment Form—Cabrillo Port LNG Deepwater Port draft EIS/EIR

Name (Please Print): MRS WILLAMAE MORTENSEN

Organization/Agency: _____

Street Address: 1741 ZIRCON AVECity: OXNARD State: CA Zip Code: 93030

Email address: _____

Source:
Public Meeting - Oxnard AM

Date: 11/30/2004

Please provide written comments in the space below and drop th

You may also submit comments

- Electronically through the Project Web site at <http://www.cabrilloport.ene.com>
- Electronically through the Docket Management System Web site (docket number 16877) at <http://dms.dot.gov>.
- Or by mail or email to following addresses:

Docket Management Facility
Room PL-401
400 Seventh Street SW
Washington, DC 20590-0001

California State Lands Commission
100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South
Sacramento, CA 95825
ogginsc@slc.ca.gov
Attention: Cy Oggins

All comments must be received by 2 p.m. PST, December 20, 2004

Comments (Use other side or attach additional sheets if necessary): I feel that

alternate route 2 should not be considered G122-1
for a LNG pipeline. There are three schools
and a hospital on Gonzales which would
be endangered by it. There are numerous sub-
divisions with high density of population
living within a few hundred feet of Gonzales
Those with breathing problems would find the
amount of dust generated dangerous to their health
during construction.

No action will be taken until the environmental review process is completed.

G122-1

The Santa Barbara Channel/Mandalay Shore Crossing/Gonzales Road Pipeline Alternative is evaluated as an alternative in the EIS/EIR; it is not the proposed Project as described in Section 2.4.

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.